

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of Washington addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I want to visit about a couple of areas in regards to terrorism. Obviously, the issues that are on this floor, the issues that have overwhelmed the United States since the ugly events of September 11 have centered on terrorism and centered on defense and the home security of this Nation.

This afternoon I want to spend a few minutes of my Special Order talking about two different types of terrorism and what we can do about it, and also incorporate in some of the defense mechanisms for some of the homeland security that I think we need to have.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by talking about a level of terrorism that has been lost in the battle, and that is the concept called ecoterrorism that is occurring within the borders of the United States.

What does ecoterrorism roughly describe? What has happened is there are some activists out there, citizens of this country or people acting within the borders of this country in regards to environmental issues that feel that they can only get attention if they do some type of destruction to some symbol, whether it is putting steel rods into a tree that they are afraid is going to be cut for timber so that the logger who comes up and uses a chain saw risks hitting that steel nail with his chain saw, and could physically harm him; and thus, the loggers, knowing that these trees may have these steel spikes inserted randomly into trees, they are afraid to log them; to the situation we had in Vail, Colorado, where they burned down a \$13 million lodge

all using the front of environmentalism.

Mr. Speaker, many of us on this floor feel very strong about the environment of this country; but none of us on this floor should tolerate for one moment ecoterrorism, the kind of things that occurred in Vail, Colorado, the kind of things that occurred in the district of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the kinds of things where people intentionally spike these trees so that somebody that goes in to log any of these trees stands the risk of losing their life if they put a chain saw to that tree. That type of behavior is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Forest and Forest Health of the Committee on Resources, and we will be focusing in the several months ahead on ecoterrorism and what we can do to encourage people in this country to work within the framework of our law if they have disagreement on environmental policies.

Unfortunately, what has happen is some people are looking for a cause. Deep down they do not care about the environment. They care about destruction, and they want to hook onto any kind of cause they can hook onto. We have seen this in many of the protests. Many of the people, outside of the professionals who have been hired to run the protests, many people do not have a deep-down belief in the cause that they are protesting or the cause for which they are assisting ecoterrorism within the boundaries of the country. It is just a cause. It is something for them to do.

□ 1800

Unfortunately what has happened is some people have turned a blind eye, because this destruction, this terrorism, is being activated under the so-called cloak of protecting the environment.

As I said earlier, all of my colleagues here feel strongly about the protection of our environment. Sure we have different debates on how we interpret that issue. But nobody on this floor, I would hope, would condone ecoterrorism in this country. And in the not too distant future, we ought to have people like the National Sierra Club, like Earth First, like the Conservation League, without prompting from the United States Congress, these organizations ought to step forward and actively condemn acts of ecoterrorism to try and forward some type of environmental agenda.

It is a problem in this country and it is a problem that has begun to escalate. It is getting bigger and bigger. They went from putting spikes in a tree to damaging equipment that was sitting on a site. Pretty soon they moved up to burning \$13 million buildings in Vail, Colorado, which is within my district. These types of acts to me are dangerous acts. Obviously they do not rise to the level of the horrible terrorism that we saw on September 11,

and I intend to spend a good part of my time this evening, or this afternoon, addressing those particular issues.

But it, nonetheless, is a small cancer of its own. It is a cancer that we have to get ahead of. And it is something that we have to have a zero tolerance for in our society.

I urge my colleagues, if you have any constituents out there that share with you any type of support that they are giving to ecoterrorist type of activity, that you actively discourage them, and if any kind of information is shared with you that these individuals are breaking the law, I think you have an obligation to go to the authorities and report your conversation with these ecoterrorists. We have to adopt and every respectable environmental organization in this country ought to adopt a zero tolerance of ecoterrorism. We have seen what happens when so-called terrorism gets taken out of context, when so-called terrorism goes to the extent that it has gone on September 11.

So we need to get on top of this ecoterrorism that we now are seeing within our own borders, our own citizens who have chosen not to work within the framework of the law but to break the law and to flagrantly break the law in such a way as to cause ecoterrorism.

We had a hearing today. We have issued a subpoena. There is an organization out there called ELF, E-L-F. This organization has a spokesman. This spokesman, I think, is probably one of the most radical American citizens in regards to ecoterrorism. I have asked that that individual be subpoenaed.

Today, the full Committee on Resources, not the subcommittee, but the full Committee on Resources issued a subpoena. We fully intend to serve that subpoena and have that individual appear in front of my subcommittee, and hopefully later on in front of the full committee, to explain on what basis that an individual or a group of individuals or an organization or an association should be allowed to step out and create this type of terrorist act under the guise of protection of the environment.

I am going to go on. I want to proceed from ecoterrorism and make the transition here to the terrorist acts of September 11.

Before I do that, Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield to my colleague the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

RURAL DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT TO FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

Mrs. CLAYTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate it very much. I do understand the importance of the subject and appreciate him allowing me to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before this body once again to focus attention on the matter of our struggling rural communities and on the need to increase our investment in rural development.